

REMARKS

This paper is in response to the Office Action of February 4, 2004. The due date for response extends to May 4, 2004.

A change of attorney, POA, and change of address was filed on April 5, 2002. However, the Office failed to record the change. A copy was resubmitted on March 30, 2004. The Office is kindly requested to forward all future communications to the undersigned attorney of record.

Claims 1-18 were filed, as noted on the official filing receipt. The Office Action cover page only notes claims 1-14. However, claims 1-18 were addressed by the Examiner in regard to the Section 103 rejection.

Objection to the Drawings:

The Examiner objected to the drawings for failing to illustrate a "development interface." As noted by the Examiner, the development interface is simply a generalized term for the "application interface." The claims have been amended to delete "development" and replace the word with "application." In addition, a new Figure 2E was added to illustrate an "application interface," as defined in the claims. The addition of Figure 2E does not add new matter. The description for new Figure 2E was already present in the as-filed specification, on page 16. Accordingly, no new description was needed to define the application interface, which was already defined and discussed in the written description.

Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw this drawing objection.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph:

Claims 1-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. The objection is in regard to the "development interface." The claims have been amended to recite "application interface" instead of "development interface." Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw this rejection.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a):

Claims 1-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Fischer (U.S. 6,549,946). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The inventions defined in independent claims 1 and 12, are submitted to be significantly different than the teachings put forth by Fischer. In Fischer, a computer having a network interface 190 is taught. The network interface 190 is further defined in Figure 2. As discussed, the network interface includes a signaling provider 193 that interacts with a number of clients 123. The clients 123 include an ATM LAN emulation client 123C, a Classic IP client 123A, and a Video client 123B. Each of these clients are shown interacting with the signaling provider 193. The signaling provider 193 is shown to include a call filter object 230, and a selector object 240. These objects in turn sit over the data link layer 250, which sits over the physical layer 260, the hardware 270 and then on network. The Examiner points to the filter object 230 as enabling filtering, and notes that each client can create an object.

Firstly, it should be evident to those skilled in the art that the "clients" of Fischer are not "clients" in the sense of communicating clients. The clients of Fischer are essentially "services," such as ATM packet generation, IP packet handling, and video handling services. These services will need to access the network 197, and the signaling provider 193 will grant access to those client/services over the network interface 190. Thus, in networking terms, the network interface 190 will enable the "computer 100" to communicate with other computers over the network 197. The computer 100 can thus be a server or a client, albeit, each will require its own network interface 190. Consequently, the clients 123 of Fischer are not *clients* that will need to be updated with functional characteristics of an object, which may be created by one of the clients. Even if each service creates an object, characteristics of the object are not communicated to the other clients 123. Further, because the call filter object 230 and the selector object 240 are all within a single local computer network interface 190, Fischer cannot be said to suggest providing a definition structure for an object utilized by a multi-user application that is executed on a distributed network.

For at least these reasons, the Applicants respectfully submit that Fischer fails to provide the requisite teaching or motivation that would suggest each element of independent claims 1 and 12. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw


this Section 103 rejection. The dependent claims are submitted to be patentable for at least the same reasons independent claims 1 and 12 are believed to be patentable.

The Applicants have reviewed the claims anew, and several formatting amendments were presented. These formatting amendments were presented to provide better readability to the claimed embodiments, and prepare the case for allowance.

A Notice of Allowance is therefore respectfully requested.

If the Examiner has any questions concerning the present amendment, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at (408) 749-6903. If any other fees are due in connection with filing this amendment, the Commissioner is also authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-0805 (Order No. SONYYP005). A duplicate copy of the transmittal is enclosed for this purpose.

Respectfully submitted,
MARTINE & PENILLA, LLP



Albert S. Penilla, Esq.
Reg. No. 39,487

710 Lakeway Drive, Suite 170
Sunnyvale, CA 94085
Telephone: (408) 749-6900
Facsimile: (408) 749-6901
Customer No. 25920